

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

---

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA and  
UNEMED CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SIEMENS HEALTHCARE DIAGNOSTICS  
INC.,

Defendant.

---

No.: 09-CV-03075-RGK-CRZ

**SIEMENS HEALTHCARE DIAGNOSTICS, INC.’S MOTION FOR PARTIAL  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,985,670  
AND REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT UNDER NECIVR 7.1(D)**

Defendant Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Inc. (“Siemens”) hereby moves for partial summary judgment of non-infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,985,670 (“the ‘670 patent”). This Motion is brought on the basis that the accused product, the Siemens’ StreamLAB Analytical Workcell (“the StreamLAB system”), does not infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any of the claims of the ‘670 patent because the StreamLAB system does not practice, literally or by equivalents, the step of marking the first carrier “with the same machine readable code as said first container,” which step is incorporated into each and every claim of the ‘670 patent. This Motion is also made on the basis that Plaintiffs’ doctrine of equivalents infringement theory is legally barred by prosecution history estoppel and the disclosure-dedication rule and is otherwise improper as a matter of law because it would result in vitiation of the “same machine readable code” limitation.

This Motion is based on this Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of the Motion, the accompanying Index of Evidence, including the

Declaration of Adaline J. Hilgard with Exhibits and the Declaration of Kerry Miller with Exhibits, the file and record in this case and whatever additional arguments are presented at the oral argument that Siemens requests pursuant to NECivR 7.1(d). Pursuant to that rule, Siemens states that oral argument is necessary because this matter presents complicated, important issues that can be addressed and further explained in oral argument. Siemens estimates that the oral argument would take no more than one hour.

DATED this 11th day of June, 2010.

/s/ John P. Bovich

Scott D. Baker  
John P. Bovich  
Doyle B. Johnson  
Adaline J. Hilgard  
James A. Daire  
REED SMITH LLP  
101 Second Street  
Suite 1800  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: +1 415 543 8700  
Facsimile: +1 415 391 8269

James G. Powers, NE #17780  
Patrick E. Brookhouser, Jr., NE # 19245  
McGrath North Mullin & Kratz, PC LLO  
First National Tower, Suite 3700  
1601 Dodge Street  
Omaha, NE 68102  
Telephone: 402 341 3070  
Facsimile: 402 341 0216  
jpowers@mcgrathnorth.com  
pbrookhouser@mcgrathnorth.com

*Counsel for Defendant  
Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This certifies the undersigned attorney filed this document with the Court using the CM/ECF system, which caused service to be made on the following attorneys on this 11th day of June, 2010

James M. Bausch  
Shawn D. Renner  
Andre R. Barry  
Cline, Williams, Wright, Johnson & Oldfather, L.L.P.  
1900 U.S. Bank Building  
233 South 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

And

Bruce M. Gagala  
Brett A. Hesterberg  
Leydig, Voit & Mayer, LTD  
Two Prudential Plaza  
180 N. Stetson Avenue, Suite 4900  
Chicago, IL 60601-6731

/s/ John P. Bovich  
John P. Bovich